

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-24 were pending in this application. Claims 2-3, 10-11, and 18-19 have been canceled by this reply, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 9, and 17.

Objections

The Specification is objected to by the Examiner for containing blank spaces. Specifically, the Specification is objected to for missing the application serial numbers and filing dates of related applications. The Specification has been amended by this reply to insert the missing elements. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate whether the drawings filed on July 16, 2003, are acceptable.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to recite the limitations of dependent claims 2-3, 10-11, and 18-19, respectively. Specifically, amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 now recite that content for a particular client device is buffered by *segmenting* the content and

sizing each segment of the content specifically for the client device to which the content is being rendered.

Support for these amendments may be found in the originally filed claims and in paragraph [0026] of the Published version of the present application. No new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Further, as the amendments to the claims merely incorporate limitations from original dependent claims, Applicants assert that no new search or consideration is required by way of the claim amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 17-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 18-19 have been canceled by this reply, thus this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 18 and 19. With respect to the remaining claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17-24 recite a computer readable medium. Applicants respectfully assert that there is sufficient enablement for a computer readable medium in the Specifications of Application Serial Nos. 10/622,035 and 10/622,047, which are incorporated by reference into the present application. Specifically, enabling detail for these claims may be found, for example, in (i) the Specification of Application Serial No. 10/622,047 at page 5, lines 10-19 and page 11, lines 7-18; and (ii) Application Serial No. 10/622,035 at Figure 1, the accompanying text, and the originally filed claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9-14, and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication No. 2002/0103935 (“Fishman”). Claims 2-3, 10-11, and 18-19 have been canceled by this reply. Thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 2-3, 10-11, and 18-19. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, independent claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to recite that content is buffered by *segmenting the content* into segments, where each segment is sized in accordance with characteristics of the specific client device to which the content is being rendered (*see* Published version of Specification, paragraph [0026]).

For example, as shown in Figure 1 of the present application, content (116) is segmented into segments (*i.e.*, where, in this example, each segment is a page), which are sized to be efficiently processed by the client device (101) (*see* paragraph [0026] of the Published version of the present application). To illustrate a particular scenario, when the client device is a mobile phone, the each segment of the content is sized and formatted to ensure each individual segment can be loaded by the mobile phone without exceeding the mobile phone’s hardware or software resources (*see* paragraph [0026] of the Published version of the present application).

Turning to the rejection of the claims, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. *See* MPEP § 2131. The Applicant respectfully assert that Fishman does not disclose buffering the content by *segmenting the content into a plurality of segments*, wherein each segment is sized specifically for the client device, as recited in the amended independent claims.

In particular, the cited portion of Fishman discloses a “mobile gateway 450 customizing Web content from Web server 410 for phone 474, pager 476, PDA 478, and other mobile clients.” Web server includes content store 430 storing data object 432.” While Web server 410 of Fishman includes storage space to store data object 423, Fishman fails to disclose that the data object or any of the content that is stored in the content store (430) is segmented in any way. In fact, as far as Fishman is concerned, the data object and/or content is stored as a whole, without breaking the content apart into segments, as required by the amended independent claims of the present application.

The Examiner asserts that Fishman discloses segments based on the fact that Fishman states “data object 432 may include text, graphics, markup, and multimedia content” (*see* Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, page 4). Applicants respectfully disagree. While Fishman clearly recites that the data object may include different types of content, Fishman does not recite that segments of the data object may include different types of content. Furthermore, graphics, text, etc., are simply types of content (taken as a whole), and Fishman does not explicitly or implicitly recite that content is broken up into segments, where one particular segment may be text and another particular segment may be graphics, etc. Thus, it is clear that Fishman fails to disclose that the data object is segmented in any way.

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over Fishman. Further, dependent claims 4-6, 12-14, and 20-22 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fishman in view of US Publication No. 2004/0203670 (“King”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Fishman fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Further, King fails to supply that which Fishman lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on King solely for the purpose of teaching invalidating buffered content when a session for the client device ends and for using a cache memory to buffer the content (*see* Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, page 5).


In view of the above, it is clear that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over Fishman and King, whether considered separately or in combination. Furthermore, dependent claims 7, 8, 15, 16, 23, and 24 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/504001).

Dated: July 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  # 60031
ALY PASHA

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant